REMARKS

Claims 6, 9, and 11 have been amended. New dependent claims 12 – 14 depending ultimately from claim 11 have been added. New dependent claims 15 – 17 depending ultimately from claim 6 have been added. Claims 6 - 17 are currently pending in the present application

In the Office Action, the drawings are objected to. Also, in the Office Action, claims 6 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cracraft et al US Patent No. 5,698,826. Additionally, in the Office Action, claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cracraft et al US Patent No. 5,698,826 in view of Arterberry et al US Patent No. 6,111,207.

With regard to the objection to the drawings, it is submitted that this objection is now obviated in view of the amendment of claim 9 to delete the term "form locking connections."

Claim 6 of the present application recites a display device for household devices, comprising a housing for receiving a plurality of light-emitting elements, the housing being at least partially covered by a film-type, partially translucent, non-transparent means having a plurality of specific regions and the light-emitting elements being arranged in the housing such that, during light emission, each light-emitting element only radiates through one of the specific regions of the translucent means and a pushbutton associated with each of the specified regions for activating a corresponding one of the light-emitting elements.

Cracraft et al US Patent No. 5,698,826 discloses a control panel 10 for an automatic dishwasher utilizing the present invention. The control panel 10 includes three primary switch pads 12A, 12B, and 12C, six optional switch pads 14, and one child lock switch pad 16. The operation of the dishwasher is controlled by the user through the switch pads 12, 14, and 16. A mounting plate 18 which is part of the control panel 10 is made from a clear plastic material and

is coupled to the back side of the control panel housing or frame 11. As shown in FIGS. 3 and 4, two circuit boards 20 are coupled to the mounting plate 18 via mounting rails 22. The mounting rails 22 are in turn coupled to the mounting plate 18. Ten push button switches 24 are mounted to one of the printed circuit boards 20 as shown in FIG. 4. A plurality of push button holes 25 are formed in the mounting plate 18 at positions corresponding to each of the switches 24, as shown in FIG. 2. When the mounting plate 18 is assembled with circuit boards 20, each push button of each switch 24 extends through the mounting plate 18 via the push button holes 25 (FIG. 4). For each switch 24, a depression 26 is formed around the corresponding hole 25 in the mounting plate 18 (FIG. 4). The depressions 26 each form a switch area 28 as shown in FIG. 2. Since the push buttons of switches 24 extend through mounting plate 18 and depressions 26 are formed in the mounting plate 18, the user can actuate a push button of a switch 24 by pressing at the switch area 28. As shown in FIGS. 2 and 3, seven incandescent lamps 30 are coupled to one of the circuit boards 20. The lamps 30 each extend partially into mounting plate 18 at the round bottom holes 32 (FIG. 3) which are formed in the clear plastic mounting plate 18. Each switch area 28 corresponding to optional switch pads 14 has a lamp 30 positioned on each side.

Arterberry et al US Patent No. 6,111,207 discloses a control panel cover 150 for assembly to a control panel 60. The control panel cover 150 snap fits onto the control panel.

With respect to the rejection of claims 6 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cracraft et al US Patent No. 5,698,826, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendment of claim 6 and the following comments.

It is submitted that the present invention is neither anticipated by, nor obvious over, Cracraft et al US Patent No. 5,698,826. For example, Cracraft et al US Patent No. 5,698,826 does not disclose "a housing for receiving a plurality of light-emitting elements, the housing being at least partially covered by a film-

type, partially translucent, non-transparent means" as recited, for example, in claim 6 of the present application. Instead, Cracraft et al US Patent No. 5,698,826 discloses a number of LEDs 35, 26 extending through a mounting plate 18 and ultimately covered by an overlay assembly 44 having a front overlay 46 formed from a clear polycarbonate - in other words, the front overlay 46 is transparent. Thus, Cracraft et al US Patent No. 5,698,826 would not provide any hint to one of skill in the art to provide a display device having the features of the claimed display device including "a housing for receiving a plurality of light-emitting elements, the housing being at least partially covered by a film-type, partially translucent, non-transparent means" as recited, for example, in claim 6 of the present application.

With respect to the rejection of claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cracraft et al US Patent No. 5,698,826 in view of Arterberry et al US Patent No. 6,111,207, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendment of claim 6 and the following comments.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the prior art of record would provide one of skill in the art with any motivation for, or any hint of the desirability of, combining Cracraft et al '826 and Arterberry et al '207 with one another. Cracraft et al '826 does not teach or suggest an control panel having light-emitting elements arranged in the housing such that, during light emission, each light-emitting element only radiates through one of the specific regions of the translucent means and a pushbutton associated with each of the specified regions for activating a corresponding one of the light-emitting elements.

Thus, Cracraft et al '826 itself would provide no motivation for one of skill in the art to selectively incorporate features of the Arterberry et al '207 arrangement. Turning to Arterberry et al '207, this prior art reference as well would provide no motivation for one of skill in the art to selectively incorporate features of the Arterberry et al '207 arrangement into the Cracraft et al '826

arrangement. A critical step in analyzing the patentability of claims pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103 is casting the mind back to the time of invention, to consider the thinking of one of ordinary skill in the art, guided only by the prior art references and the then-accepted wisdom in the field. See *In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 999, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Close adherence to this methodology is especially important in cases where the very ease with which the invention can be understood may prompt one "to fall victim to the insidious effect of a hindsight syndrome wherein that which only the invention taught is used against its teacher." *Id.* (quoting *W.L. Gore & Assocs. Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1553, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

Applicant respectfully believes that any teaching, suggestion, or incentive possibly derived from the prior art is only present with hindsight judgment in view of the instant application. "It is impermissible, however, simply to engage in a hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention, using the applicant's structure as a template and selecting elements from references to fill the gaps. . . . The references themselves must provide some teaching whereby the applicant's combination would have been obvious." *In re Gorman*, 18 USPQ2d 1885, 1888 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (emphasis added by applicants). Arterberry et al '207 does not teach or suggest light-emitting elements being arranged in the housing such that, during light emission, each light-emitting element only radiates through one of the specific regions of the translucent means and a pushbutton associated with each of the specified regions for activating a corresponding one of the light-emitting elements. Thus, no teaching is present in either Cracraft et al '826 and Arterberry et al '207 for one of skill in the art to selectively modify their respective arrangements in the manner set forth in the Office Action.

It is a requirement for a *prima facie* case of obviousness, that the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Upon evaluation of the Office action, it is respectfully believed that the evidence adduced is insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 7 and 8.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, entry of the present Amendment and allowance of claims 6 – 17 are respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned. If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Respectfully submitted,

Russell W. Warnock
Registration No. 32,860
June 26, 2008

BSH Home Appliances Corporation
100 Bosch Blvd.
New Bern, NC 28562
Phone: 252-672-7927
Fax: 714-845-2807
russ.warnock@bshg.com